

### III. REMARKS

This amendment is being submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 7, 2004. Claim 5 has been amended to address certain objections and rejections of the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 5 in light of the amendments and remarks made herein.

#### Claim Objections and Rejections

As required by the Examiner, claim 5 has been amended to correct an informality; the word "though" has been replaced with the word "through." Additionally, based on certain comments of the Examiner in the "Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)" section of the Final Office Action, the limitation of "said receptacle" has been removed to address the antecedent basis issue. Also, regarding the Examiner's statement in this same section of the Office Action that claim 5 is indefinite because "it is unclear what size/dimensions is considered to meet the limitation 'of sufficient size to accommodate a human finger or thumb,'" the Applicant respectfully traverses an objection or rejection on these grounds. The Applicant asserts that this limitation is not vague or indefinite because despite some variance, most human fingers or thumbs are similar enough in size for one skilled in the art to appreciate and discern the dimensions in question given the stated purpose of the aperture.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons set forth herein and in the Appeal Brief, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/07/04

Courtney J. Miller

Courtney J. Miller  
Attorney for Applicant / Reg. No. 45,366  
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP  
1100 Fifth Third Center / 21 East State Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 621-7015 / (614) 621-0010 (fax)

First Amendment After Final Rejection  
U.S. Serial No. 10/056,277  
Express Mail No. EL 981814020 US